

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

APPLICATION NO.	. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,810		08/25/2003	Naoki Imachi	SNY-039	1318
20374	7590	10/19/2006		EXAMINER	
KUBOVCI	K & KU	BOVCIK	CHU, HELEN OK		
SUITE 710 900 17TH S'	TREET N	W		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGT	ON, DC	20006	1745		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/646,810	IMACHI ET AL.				
Office Action S	ummary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Helen O. Chu	1745				
The MAILING DATE o Period for Reply	f this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with	h the correspondence addres	:s			
A SHORTENED STATUTOF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, I - Extensions of time may be available to after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailir - If NO period for reply is specified abov - Failure to reply within the set or exten Any reply received by the Office later earned patent term adjustment. See	FROM THE MAILING D inder the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 ing date of this communication. we, the maximum statutory period ded period for reply will, by statute than three months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 36(a). In no event, however, may a rep	ATION.  ply be timely filed  HS from the mailing date of this community  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) Responsive to commu	nication(s) filed on <u>02 A</u>	<u>ugust 2006</u> .					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> .	·						
3) Since this application				rits is			
closed in accordance	with the practice under <i>t</i>	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims							
4)	(s) is/are withdra allowed. ejected. objected to.	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers			•				
9)☐ The specification is obj	ected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent D 3) Information Disclosure Statement Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/15/2006	rawing Review (PTO-948) (s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)	ummary (PTO-413) I/Mail Date formal Patent Application 				

Application/Control Number: 10/646,810

Art Unit: 1745

## **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. Applicant's Amendment was received on August 8, 2006. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 17 has been cancelled.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S.C. code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The rejections under 35 U.S.C 102(b), as being anticipated by Cho (JP 11-126633) on claims 1-4 and 9-16 are withdrawn because Applicant has amended claim 1.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over lwamoto et al (US Publication 2002/0039677 A1).

In regards to claim 1-16, the Iwamoto et al reference teaches a non-aqueous electrolyte secondary battery (Paragraph 3) with a polyethylene separator (Paragraph 104), an electrolytic solution made of ethylene carbonate and a gamma-butyrolactone solvent (Paragraph 7) and teaches a tetrahydrofuran carbonate as an additive (Applicants' wettability agent; Paragraph 42) at a preferable 0.5-5 weight by parts

Application/Control Number: 10/646,810 Page 3

Art Unit: 1745

(Paragraph 44). The Iwamoto et al reference also teaches if the amount of additives is less than 0.1 part by weight, the effect to inhibit evolution of gases is not improved so much, and if it exceeds 10 parts by weight, the film formed on the electrodes is too thick and discharge characteristics deteriorates. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to choose the instantly claimed value through process optimization, since it has been held that the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable values involve only routine skill in the art. See In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Though the Applicants' claimed invention requires a tetrahydrofuran as an additive, under the conditions given in the battery and in combination with the electrolytic solution, the Iwamoto et al reference teaches an equivalent ester tetrahydrofuran derivative. These compounds share close structural similarities between chemical compounds of homolog, analogues, and isomers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use tetrahydrofuran because one skilled in the art would expect similar chemical structure to exhibit similar properties. See In re Payne, 606 f.2d 303, 203 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963) and see In re Dillion, 919 F.2D 688, 16 USPQ2d 1897 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Furthermore, it would be inherent that the reductive decomposition potential of the wettability improving agent is no greater than 0.0V because this is only a reference state and that the intrinsic properties of the wettability agent tetrahydrofuran carbonate has a decomposition potential of 4.8 - 5.2 V.

### Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 1745

6. Applicant's arguments filed August 2, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's principal argument is

A) an ether (tetrahydrofuran) and a carbonate (tetrahydrofuran carbonate) have significant differences in chemical characteristics and properties.

In response to Applicants, please consider the following:

A) Tetrahydrofuran carbonate is an ester carbonic acid derivative of tetrahydrofuran. They are both strong Lewis bases having a similar property of donating electrons and neutralizing a Lewis acid such s hydrofluoric acids present in lithium batteries as evidence by Ishidoya et al. (US Patent 5,660,937; Column12, Lines 35-60).

#### Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Application/Control Number: 10/646,810 Page 5

Art Unit: 1745

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Helen O. Chu whose telephone number is (571) 272-5162. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-4: 30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Trainer Susy Tsang Foster can be reached on (571) 272-1293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HOC

SUSYTSANG-FOSTER PRIMARY EXAMINER

Aug Isay Lister